



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,748	02/15/2007	Robert Henri-Marcel Stouffs	19790-008US1 CER03-0015	8191
26191 7590 03/19/2010 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER GWARTNEY, ELIZABETH A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/19/2010		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/576,748

**Applicant(s)**

STOUFFS ET AL.

**Examiner**

Elizabeth Gwartney

**Art Unit**

1794

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14, 16-18 and 20-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14, 16-18 and 20-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-06)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20060703
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The Amendment filed December 30, 2009 has been entered. Claims 15 and 19 have been cancelled. Claims 14, 16-18 and 20-37 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 14, 16-18 and 20-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauregard et al. (US 6,458,401).

Regarding claims 14, 16-17, 20 and 33 and Beauregard et al. disclose a process for preparing powder containing crystalline particles of maltitol comprising the steps of:

(a) continuously mixing maltitol syrup having a dry mater content of at least 70% by weight and a maltitol content of at least 85% by weight on a dry matter basis, the mixing being effected by simultaneously dispersing the maltitol syrup and maltitol containing seeds into an open rotating bed containing maltitol based granules (C2/L35-45);

(b) drying the granulated product obtained in a fluidized bed to achieve a residual moisture content of *not more than* 2% (C3/L47-48);

(c) grinding the granules to the required particle size and then sorting the particles by sifting (C3/L49-51); and

(d) recycling the particles eliminated by sifting to the granulator for use as maltitol containing seeds (C3/L49-52).

Beauregard et al. disclose that an air atomizing nozzle is used to spray the aqueous maltitol syrup onto the rotating bed in the granulator (C3/L26-28). Given Beauregard et al. disclose an open bed wherein air is used to disperse maltitol syrup onto maltitol seed material, it is clear that the mixing process takes place in a fluid bed.

Beauregard et al. disclose that the maltitol syrup and seed material are introduced into the granulator to achieve a seed/syrup weight ratio of 4 parts seed to 1 part maltitol syrup (C4/L47-51).

Regarding claim 18, Beauregard et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as set forth above and that the matured granules are submitted to a rough grinding and dried in a fluidized bed using air at about 90°C (C4/L65-67).

Regarding claims 21-23, Beauregard et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as set forth above. Beauregard et al. also disclose that the temperature of maltitol syrup is 80°C (C3/L20-21).

Regarding claims 24-26, Beauregard et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as set forth above. Given Beauregard et al. disclose a process for preparing maltitol substantially similar to that presently claimed, it is clear that the powder containing crystalline particles of maltitol would intrinsically have maltitol content from about 90% w/w to about 99.5%.

Regarding claims 27- 30, Beauregard et al. disclose a process for preparing powder containing crystalline particles of maltitol comprising the steps of:

(a) loading powder containing crystalline maltitol, i.e. seed material, into an open rotating bed (C3/L16-28);

(b) adding maltitol syrup into the open bed, wherein said maltitol syrup has a dry substance content of about 70% (C3/L16-28);

(c) spraying said maltitol syrup into the open bed to coat said seed material, wherein the maltitol syrup is sprayed onto the maltitol seed material using an air atomizing nozzle at a temperature of at least 80°C (C2/L54-57, C3/L16-28);

(d) drying said coated seed material in a fluidized bed to achieve a residual moisture content of *not more than* 2% (C3/L16-50);

(c) grinding the granules to the required particle size and then sorting the particles by sifting (C3/L49-51); and

(d) recycling the particles eliminated by sifting to the granulator for use as maltitol containing seeds (C3/L49-52).

Regarding claims 31-32, Beauregard et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as set forth above. Given Beauregard et al. disclose a process for preparing maltitol substantially similar to that presently claimed, it is clear that the powder containing crystalline particles of maltitol would intrinsically have maltitol content from about 95% w/w to about 97%.

Regarding claims 34-37, Beauregard et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as set forth above. Beauregard et al. also disclose sugar free shortbread cookies and oatmeal cookies comprising 18% by weight maltitol (C5/Example 2) and a tablet comprising 99% maltitol (C4/L11-16).

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 14-37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth Gwartney whose telephone number is (571) 270-3874. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday; 7:30AM - 3:30PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks can be reached on (571) 272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1794

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/E. G./

Examiner, Art Unit 1794

/Keith D. Hendricks/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794